

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 250 042

JC 840 579

TITLE Planning and Accreditation: A Survey of Attitudes of Policymakers. Improving Community College Evaluation and Planning: Project Working Papers Numbers Five, Six, and Seven.

INSTITUTION California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.; Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Aptos, CA. Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges.

SPONS AGENCY Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.

PUB DATE 83

NOTE 32p.; For related documents, see JC 840 576-584.

PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Accreditation (Institutions); *College Planning; *Community Colleges; *Educational Policy; Governing Boards; Legislators; Policy Formation; *Public Officials; Surveys; Two Year Colleges

IDENTIFIERS *California; *Hawaii

ABSTRACT

One of a series of papers resulting from a Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) project to improve evaluation and planning in community colleges, this working paper presents the results of interviews with community college policymakers conducted to assess their views on matters such as non-governmental accreditation, evaluation and planning, the role of various groups in public accountability, and the specific purposes of the FIPSE project. Following introductory material on the FIPSE project and the surveys, the paper presents the results of the interviews with 10 members of the California legislature, 11 key legislative and executive branch analysts, 3 members of the California Postsecondary Education Commission, and 5 leaders of education and advocacy organizations. This section includes a summary of the ideas suggested by the group for designing and carrying out the FIPSE project, a tally of responses, and sample comments. The next section provides the results from interviews with the 15 members of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, which cover the interests and concerns of board member and statewide priorities in the areas of mission, access, governance, fiscal accountability, the FIPSE project, the state information system, comparative data, accreditation, local governance, comprehensive planning, and accountability. The final section presents the results from interviews with administrators, faculty, and government leaders in Hawaii involved in community college affairs. (HB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED250042

Improving
Community
Education
and Planning

PROJECT
WORKING
PAPER
NUMBER
FIVE SIX
AND SEVEN

PLANNING AND ACCREDITATION A SURVEY OF ATTITUDES OF POLICYMAKERS

JC 840571

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Hayward

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Chancellor's Office
California Community Colleges
Western Association of Accrediting
for Community and Junior Colleges

FALL 1982
WINTER 1983

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

Other Reports and Papers:

- o College Planning: Strategies for Staff Assessment of the Environment
- o Census Users Manual
- o Report on Learner Outcomes Symposium
- o Working Papers on the FIPSE Project:
 - #4 Delineation of Responsibilities
 - #8 Information System Support
 - #9 Evaluating Statewide Priorities
 - #10 Measuring Community College Outcomes: The State-of-the-Art

from the project on

Improving Community College Evaluation and Planning

jointly sponsored by the

Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges
and

Western Associating Accrediting Commission for Community
and Junior Colleges

and partly supported by a grant from the federal Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education.

PROJECT WORKING PAPERS NOS. FIVE, SIX AND SEVEN

PLANNING AND ACCREDITATION:
A SURVEY OF ATTITUDES OF POLICYMAKERS

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Preface	i
California State Policymakers	2
Who and Why	2
Major Findings	2
Response Tally	5
California State Board of Governors	11
Major Interests and Concerns	12
Statewide Priorities	13
Usefulness of FIPSE Project	15
Improving State Information	15
Importance of Local Governance	16
Value of Collaboration	17
Increasing Confidence	18
Summary	18
Hawaii Policymakers	19
Commitment to Planning	19
Higher Education Planning	21
Community Colleges and the FIPSE Project	23

PLANNING AND ACCREDITATION:
A SURVEY OF ATTITUDES OF POLICYMAKERS

PREFACE

These working papers on the Survey of Policymakers are part of a series of papers resulting from a three-year project to improve evaluation and planning in community colleges. The project is sponsored jointly by the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges and by the Western Association Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. Project work is concentrated in California and Hawaii, the jurisdiction of the Western Accrediting Commission. Support for the project is provided by community colleges in these states, the two sponsoring agencies, and by the Federal Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE).

Project objectives include developing a clear statement of the responsibilities for evaluation and planning that are appropriate for state control agencies, accrediting commissions, and for local community colleges. Tensions about the appropriate division of these responsibilities exist throughout the country. A long tradition of cooperation in California and Hawaii, however, has created a most congenial atmosphere in which to analyze and clarify the proper delineation of roles.

Project staff also are developing a series of tools to improve the state-of-the-art of evaluation and planning for community colleges. Beginning in the Fall 1982, these tools have been introduced, used and assessed in a dozen such workshops, self-study seminars, symposia, and problem-solving sessions conducted in California and Hawaii. These activities will continue through the Fall of 1984. While project work is being concentrated in the two states, it should be possible to generalize the results to virtually any community college operation or governance structure in the country.

Three groups of persons who influence and make policy in matters related to the objectives of the project to Improve Evaluation and Planning in Community Colleges were interviewed in year one. The major findings from these three sets of interviews are presented in this report. The first group included California legislators and their counselors who have particular interest and influence in community college affairs; and heads of agencies and professional groups who meet similar criteria. The second group included all 15 members of the State Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. Group three was composed of policymakers in Hawaii from state government, professional groups, regents and other officials of the University of Hawaii and community college leaders.

The purposes of the interviews were (1) to assess the views of policymakers on such matters as non-governmental accreditation, evaluation and planning in community colleges, the role of various groups in public accountability, and

the specific purposes of the FIPSE Project; and (2) to promote knowledge of the Project and its potentials for improving evaluation and planning at local and state levels in California and Hawaii.

Findings from the surveys have been used in assessing and modifying project directions and in conducting the training, dissemination, and public relation activities of the Project.

The reader will note that we, the project staff, have other responsibilities. Consequently, were it not for the help and assistance of countless others in both Hawaii and California, this effort would be impossible. Unfortunately, space does not permit us to list all these individuals. However, we do want to thank Evelyn Stacey of the state Chancellor's Office and Rich Montori of Monterey Peninsula College for their excellent work, respectively, in typing the manuscript and in preparing the art and printing for this document.

We especially appreciate the support from FIPSE. Receipt of the Fund's grant has set in motion a series of commitments on the part of others whose support (in money and in kind) is essential to the successful completion of this project and the implementation of its results.

Chuck McIntyre
Project Director

Robert Swenson
Project Co-director

Dale Tillery
Principal Project Consultant

Director,
Analytical Studies Unit
State Chancellor's Office
California Community
Colleges

Executive Director,
Western Accrediting
Commission for
Community and Junior
Colleges

Professor Emeritus,
School of Education
University of California,
Berkeley

CALIFORNIA STATE POLICYMAKERS

WHO AND WHY

The final round of interviews of principal agents whose views would be important to the development and outcomes of the FIPSE Project has been completed in Sacramento. The interviewees, while not necessarily representative of their legislative, agency or advocacy groups, are all persons who have influence in community college affairs. Furthermore, each has experiences and ideas relevant to the Project's primary goal of improving evaluation and planning capabilities within the community college network of California. Among the 29 persons interviewed were 10 members of the California Legislature, 11 key legislative and executive branch analysts, three members of the California Postsecondary Education Commission, and five leaders of educational and advocacy organizations.

The interviews had two major objectives: (1) to provide useful ideas for designing and carrying out the Project; and (2) to provide information to each agent about the Project and related issues. Both of these objectives have been realized beyond expectations. In part, these results are due to the interest and serious contributions of each person interviewed; the supportive letter of purpose from Chancellor Gerry Hayward; and the tireless facilitation by Moni Van Kamp. Even though the first round of interviews took place during the closing days of legislative decisions on the 1983 budget, the level of cooperation was remarkable. On the other hand, certain key individuals were called to the floor or conference just before or during interviews. Thus, a second round of interviews did take place in August. A letter of appreciation from the Chancellor has been sent to all persons interviewed.

The interviews reported here were useful in preparing a similar interview schedule for members of the Governing Board. This second survey took place primarily by telephone during the last week of July. The findings, along with those from the principal agents survey, was reported to the Board of Governors during their August retreat.

MAJOR FINDINGS

- o There was universal conviction about the importance of community college education in California; and general confidence in the solvability of problems related to institutional mission, fiscal support, and governance.
- o People were concerned about the lack of consensus regarding the mission of the community colleges. A member of the executive branch voiced what others suggested when he noted that "the community colleges have lost direction"; and an agency head observed that "the mission is evolving from fiscal reality".

"Remember 50% - 70% of high school graduates enroll."

- o There was general agreement on the importance of leadership by the Board of Governors and the Chancellor in resolving the priorities (mission) issue. A high percentage, particularly from the Legislature, commented on the importance of the Master Plan and its updating in clarifying the role of community colleges in an articulated system of education.
- o Local authority in governance of community colleges has very wide support in spite of concerns about statewide priorities and limitations on local decisions resulting from state funding. Many said "the state doesn't want control." However, a few preferred a state system.
- o Preferences for statewide priorities were almost universally cast in the language of program functions. Although almost everyone advocated quality preparation for transfer, most associated this priority with education for employment. The latter, career/vocational education, was almost invariably mentioned first as a statewide priority. Although only one person said that such priorities should include the qualification of students admitted to specific programs, others named counseling as important for student decisionmaking.
- o Avocational education and community services were rarely identified as statewide objectives, and when they were, it was usually in the context of funding from local sources. Individuals from all groups, however, urged support for "full offerings", recognition of community colleges as "safety nets", or as "adult high schools".
- o Remediation/developmental education was offered as a statewide priority by about half of the interviewees. Although this priority usually came as an afterthought, the impression was that most would support remediation if specifically asked about its importance.
- o Over half of those interviewed had been students at community colleges, and supportive things were said about their experiences, particularly the quality of teaching. All but two people had substantial associations with community colleges before beginning their present positions.
- o There was wide diversity in assessing the adequacy of statewide information and in suggestions for improving the system. However, almost everyone had suggestions to make. The most negative comment was that "California is primitive in its information systems"; and the most positive "information from the Chancellor's Office is generally good." An important theme stressed by individuals in each grouping had to do with the relevance of data and the better interpretation and reporting of what was already available. "Interpretation is the key."
- o Among categories considered most important in improving the community college system were data about student outcomes, better

and more complete institutional finance information, and the ability to establish trend lines for institutional data. A user of such data said data records at the colleges were bad, and that longitudinal files were costly and involved issues of privacy.

- o Using an experimental set of statewide priorities for a period of time, evaluating their usefulness, and then revising them if appropriate was viewed as a good or reasonable idea by most interviewees. The call for leadership in arriving at statewide priorities was widespread.
- o A move toward more comprehensive planning and evaluation in the Chancellor's Office and in the colleges was supported by almost everyone. Fragmentation was seen as a real problem, and at least one assemblyman blamed the Legislature for the lack of good planning. The head of a key agency said that "synthesis is essential for policy and political response".
- o Most people made suggestions about ways to increase confidence in the accountability of community colleges. The two most common themes were the need for more leadership/initiative, and for cooperation.
- o The FIPSE Project (with its collaboration among California community colleges, the Accrediting Commission, and the colleges) was viewed as very important or useful by nearly everyone. The head of a major agency noted that although the Project was complex and had some risks, "it is the best game in town."
- o Although few people know much about the accreditation process or about the use of new standards, there was near universal receptivity to a role for accreditation in contributing to confidence in community college accountability. A senator commented that "accreditation is the way to go". A few urged balanced teams and objectivity.
- o The training workshops being planned for the FIPSE Project were seen as useful and/or cost effective by nearly everyone. Furthermore, most people made suggestions to insure workshop success. Among the suggestions were "success should be shared", "get down to practical stuff", and "make sure that top decision-makers are involved or are really supportive".

RESPONSE TALLY

The attached tally shows the majority of responses to each interview question. Some data are missing because of the pressure of certain interview conditions and the difficulties of getting some people to respond fully to a structured interview. For each question, a few useful comments are quoted.

When response categories are mutually exclusive they are so marked. Responses for certain questions are missing because of dominant interests of interviewees. In some cases, responses are inferred from comments elsewhere in the interview.

1. Have you had any association or experiences with community colleges prior to your present position (office)?

(Not mutually exclusive)

STUDENT <u>13</u>	(PRE-TRANSFER <u>11</u>	VOC/ADULT ED <u>2</u>)
TEACHER <u>3</u>	TRUSTEE <u>0</u>	OTHER <u>4</u>
COMMUNITY/POLITICAL INTEREST <u>14</u>		NONE/LITTLE <u>3</u>

Frequent Comments:

"good teachers"

"I couldn't have made it without the community college."

"There is new attention to community colleges and their mission."

2. What aspects of community college affairs are most related to your present responsibilities and interests? What bills or legislative decisions have you sponsored (or advocated)?

(Not mutually exclusive)

LEGISLATION <u>9</u>	STRATEGIC COMMITTEES <u>9</u>
ANALYST FUNCTIONS <u>11</u>	FISCAL/BUDGET <u>10</u>
ADVOCACY/LOBBYING <u>5</u>	COORDINATION/MONITORING <u>3</u>

Useful Comments:

"You can't separate policy from finance."

"The state doesn't want control."

"We need an institutional voice."

"We need a new state funding policy which will give more flexibility to local districts."

"I would prefer a state system."

3. Do you have priorities about what students should get out of attending community college? What information do you now get about such outcomes? What information would you find useful?

PREPARE PEOPLE FOR WORK 26
QUALITY PREPARATION FOR TRANSFER 26
DEVELOPMENTAL/REMEDIATION 13
COMMUNITY SERVICES 6

COUNSELING 4
AVOCATIONAL 6

(These are not mutually exclusive)

Questions about outcome information led to responses: responses ranged from "information now is pretty good" to "I seek out my own information." to "Student data records are bad."

Useful Ideas:

"Validity of student demand; preparation for emerging employment fields."

4. What do you think the major statewide priorities should be for California community colleges?

(SEE QUESTION NO. 3)

"Priorities have to be ranked in order of importance."

"Community needs were met but we grew without heart."

"Priorities also have to deal with abilities/willingness of students to achieve."

"There should be more articulation among agencies."

"The local districts should have financial incentives to achieve goals."

"We should support programs which lead to jobs."

"We should have statewide salary bargaining."

"With limited dollars, we should probably take the best prepared students."

"The community college is a social safety net."

5. Do you have recommendations or views about how the California Community Colleges' Board of Governors should go about deciding on a set of state-wide priorities? Do you see advantages in using a set of priorities for several years, evaluating their usefulness, and then revising them if appropriate?

(Mutually exclusive)

BUILD ON MASTER PLAN 6

REVIEW MASTER PLAN WITH OTHER SEGMENTS 9

"BOTTOMS UP" -- LOCAL EFFORT 3

LEADERSHIP 5

(Mutually exclusive)

FIPSE

GOOD IDEA 10

WILL PROBABLY WORK/REASONABLE 6

NO OPINION 2

Useful Ideas:

"Governance structure gets in way."

"Plan for high uncertainty, but keep balance."

"Recognize that programs should be student driven."

"Chancellor must lead."

"Segments could review Master Plan without legislative mandate."

"FIPSE Project is the right way to go."

6. What type of public information and institutional reporting would contribute to sound budgetary and other legislative decisions?

(Not mutually exclusive)

COMPARABLE INSTITUTIONAL DATA 8

(specific suggestions 5)

STUDENT LONGITUDINAL DATA 16

INSTITUTIONAL FINANCIAL DATA 12

OTHER 4

Useful Ideas:

"People are turning to CPEC."

"There are problems of what to do with existing data."

"Information has to get out to people ... we need briefings."

"Interpretation is the key."

"Data are piecemeal." "Information is generally good."

"Data ought not to be used for state control."

"We do field visits to get our own information."

"Be wary of too much data."

"Data collection is now done badly."

"Don't fill shelves with data."

7. In completing the community college statewide information system, what comparative institutional data would be useful for your own needs? For the local colleges and the Chancellor's Office?

(Mutually exclusive)

SPECIFIC SUGGESTIONS MADE 24
NO SUBSTANTIAL SUGGESTIONS 1
STRESSED DIFFICULTIES/COST 2

Useful Ideas:

- "Data reported in more policy-relevant ways."
- "Need to know what happens to students."
- "Raw data are often dangerous ... it's important to have people who can interpret data."
- "CPEC gets pushed into data gathering."
- "Need socio-economic background data on students."
- "It is important to draw trends."
- "Systemize reporting; it's now too segmented."

8. Planning and evaluation, at the state and local levels, tends to be specialized and segmented (examples are EOPS, Vocational Education, education for the Handicapped). Do you see advantages in more comprehensive or overall planning?

(Mutually exclusive)

VERY SUPPORTIVE | 9
GOOD IDEA 7
PERHAPS USEFUL 2

Useful Ideas:

- "Field planning is less piecemeal than in Chancellor's Office."
- "Synthesis is necessary for policy and political response."
- "Use statewide priorities."
- "Legislature is to blame for lack of planning."
- "Vocational education needs to be looked at with great care."
- "We will have a state system in 10-12 years."
- "Input should also come from the Legislature and the local level."
- "Prefer state system, but it won't happen."
- "Planning has to deal with big picture."
- "Rope them in so they will work together."
- "Local institutions do better planning than the Chancellor's Office."

9. In view of widespread interest in deregulation and decentralization of decisionmaking, how important to you is local authority in the governance of community colleges?

(Mutually exclusive)

GREAT SUPPORT 13
CONFIDENCE IN LOCAL AUTHORITY 4
YES, BUT WITHIN STATE MISSION 9
NOT SUPPORTIVE 1

Useful Ideas:

- "But not necessarily elected trustees at local level."
- "Chancellor should oversee." "Chancellor has no constituency."
- "Conflict among institutions is bad."
- "Probably should have statewide salary bargaining."
- "Got to get local trustees to involve community."
- "Have to find ways of combining statewide priorities with local objectives."
- "Legislature should put trust in Chancellor's Office."
- "Local districts should have performance contracts with lots of freedom ... with evaluation of results."

10. What would increase your confidence in the accountability of community colleges? Specifically, what might you expect from:

- Local community college districts?
 - "Good education of board members."
- The Board of Governors and the Chancellor's Office?
 - "Leadership."
- The Accrediting Commission for California Community and Junior Colleges?
 - "Objectivity, balanced membership ..."

(Mutually exclusive)

SUGGESTIONS MADE 14
NO SUGGESTIONS 2

QUESTION NOT FULLY ENGAGED 8

ACCREDITATION

POSITIVE ATTITUDES 5 LITTLE KNOWLEDGE 9 AMBIVALENT 2
GOOD RECEPTIVITY TO ACCREDITATION ROLE 23
AWARE OF NEW STANDARDS 2 NOT AWARE OF NEW STANDARDS 18

Useful Ideas:

- "Accreditation must be above reproach." "...not self-perpetuating."
- "Support peer review."
- "Accreditation should be more broadly based."
- "Cooperation leads to self-improvement."
- "Commission and teams need more teachers."

11. The Chancellor's Office and the Accrediting Commission have a three-year federal grant to improve evaluation and planning in California community colleges and to reduce duplication of the review process. Do you view such collaboration as a step in the right direction for improved accountability?

(Mutually exclusive)

IMPORTANT/GOOD DIRECTION 23

USEFUL 5

DIFFICULT BUT WON'T HURT 1

Useful Ideas:

"...best game in town."

"Connection with Chancellor's role is important."

"Integrity with collaboration."

"Accountability of network."

"Go! Go! Go!"

"Accreditation concern for quality could be useful for Board of Governors."

"I'm concerned about faculty representation in accreditation."

"It's a good idea if goals are even half met."

12. The Project includes training workshops as well as joint review visits to the colleges by members of the Chancellor's Office staff and accreditation teams. Does the process strike you as cost effective? Are there things you would stress in the training workshops? Are you aware of the new accrediting standards for assessing institutional quality and achievements?

(Mutually exclusive)

YES, COST EFFECTIVE 5

WORKSHOPS WILL HELP 11

PERHAPS 2

SUGGESTIONS MADE FOR WORKSHOPS 14

Useful Ideas:

"Lots of knowledge before workshops." "Shouldn't be threatening."

"Key decisionmakers involved."

"Good start."

"State leaps into vacuums ... we won't if things are being done."

"Sharing is important."

"Statewide view is to look for bad apple."

"Get down to practical stuff."

"Top of pyramid must be involved."

CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES*

In August 1982, all 15 members of the Board of Governors were interviewed by Dale Tillery. The structured interviews, with one exception, were by telephone and ranged from 20 minutes to two hours in duration. The average interview was about 40 minutes. Although the original purposes of the interviews were to provide input to the FIPSE staff in carrying out the Project and to share its goals with the Board, it soon became evident that the interviews had value in facilitating the Board's annual retreat at Lake Tahoe.

Compelling impressions about the Board itself came from interviews and can best be expressed in the words of individual Board members:

"We have a new sense of confidence; we can get it all together. It is going to work!"

"The members of the Board are dedicated people. We care."

"The Board of Governors is interested in doing the right thing. Its members are intelligent, have energy, and will do a good job."

The will and vitality to face very difficult issues while respecting the diversity of perspective among its members was evident throughout the interviews. The need to know and be skillfully informed was ever present and was stated head on in an early interview: "I'm interested in everything!" Some members want to get things moving and envision "a lean, mean system of community colleges". Others call for "opening minds; asking what would it be like to start over again".

These various perspectives will show in this report, but more compelling are the areas of genuine consensus. Had we been able to feed back these first-round viewpoints in a second interview, it is apparent that even greater consensus would emerge. But that is what we are about in Tahoe! When you have heard, read, and discussed these ideas with one another, consensus building and decisionmaking should be well under way.

The opening generalizations about Board thinking should be useful, but the real flavor comes out in your own words. Some quotations will be included in the open oral report and others in this summary of the interviews. No attributions will be made, but individual Board members may want to do so in the course of our work at Tahoe. Incidentally, several of you said that the interviews were helpful in focussing your thinking and in preparing for Tahoe.

This informal report of individual perspectives in no way reflects decisions or policies of the Governing Board.

*Written as a report to the Board.

MAJOR INTERESTS AND CONCERNS OF BOARD MEMBERS

The issue of determining statewide priorities (mission) was of major interest or concern to most members and was so stated by half of you at the beginning of the interviews. The substance of these concerns are presented later in the report.

Again, most members voiced concerns about funding and financial issues, with particular focus on program imbalance resulting from ADA funding; and on the relationship between who pays and who controls.

Access and issues of tuition/fees were the next most commonly-stated concerns, although both topics were discussed somewhere in the interviews by all of you.

A few of you linked financial aid to your thinking about tuition/fees; and there were differences among you as to whether tuition/fees should be for everyone or just for avocational courses. Few of you seemed ready to take firm positions on these crucial issues although two of you spoke against tuition and two argued for the importance of all students paying something in enhancing student achievement.

Concern about governance issues was prominent in all interviews although only four members identified it as a major concern in response to the opening question. The nature of the concerns will be shown in the section on statewide priorities.

The following interests/concerns were mentioned by only one or two members in the beginning but were often echoed by others elsewhere in the interviews. I've attempted to cluster them a bit:

- Accountability of the state system
- The need for minimum standards
- Misuses of remedial education
- Concerns about the public image of community colleges
- How the system works
- Industry/community college relations

Leadership by the Board and Chancellor

- Access for whom?
- Paying full cost of apprenticeship programs
- Premature decisions about tuition/fees

- The quality of education
- Innovation
- What to do about vocational education
- Cutbacks in essential programs and services
- The adequacy of guidance
- Service to the handicapped
- Role of continuing education

USEFUL QUOTATIONS (clustered by themes)

"We need authority to have both fees and course credit."
"ADA funding doesn't make sense."

"Community colleges have run amuck on ADA funding, therefore, our San Diego decisions were essential."

"Finances affect every other issue we consider."

"Free education is a misnomer because students are turned away."

"The basic mission of community colleges has been lost."

"I'm concerned about the shifting balance in our programs."

"Are the community colleges on the right track?"

"The community college is a particularly enlightened segment ..."

"The colleges have done a good job in providing access."

"Poverty is the greatest prejudice in America."

"The future of California community colleges depends upon us resolving the governance issue."

"Who speaks for the community college is still a concern for me."

"The Board's positions on things may sometimes have different effects than anticipated."

"We have to be concerned about policy matters."

STATEWIDE PRIORITIES

MISSION

In just this language some Board members advocated a "balanced program" or "campus"; others did so by implication.

Nearly all members stressed the importance of:

- basic undergraduate education for transfer
- (certificate) vocational programs
- remediation (essentially for the above)
- continuing education

There were always qualifying remarks about each function.

The major concern about transfer education is that it be well designed to facilitate transfer and subsequent achievement.

Vocational education should be responsive not only to local community needs but to the market and economic change.

The level and standards of remediation were of wide concern, and some members said it should not be at the high school level.

Continuing education should be targeted to bring students "up to the state-of-the-art", to provide occupational mobility, and to facilitate re-entry to work and advanced education.

All members who viewed avocational education as a priority said it should be paid for by fees.

Only one person mentioned counseling as a statewide priority, but others stressed its importance in the course of interviews.

WHO GETS EDUCATED

Most Board members explicitly said that wide access should be a statewide priority, and several added that "no one should be denied".

Several members stressed affirmative action for various groups --- minorities, the handicapped, and "those who need education the most". A third of you said that if necessary "priority should be given to young people" (achievement).

GOVERNANCE (ALSO SEE QUESTION 5)

Shared governance is seen as a statewide priority in order to insure a balance between Board of Governors' role (leadership, advocacy, enforcement) and of local boards in responding to local community needs and insuring the quality of programs and services.

Although nearly every Board member took the position that local boards were essential for community colleges, there was equal conviction in advocating leadership and coordinating roles for the Board of Governors and the Chancellor.

A few members suggested that it was a state interest to insure that local boards are well trained, a position which may be different from the two members who said that the Board should restrict itself to statewide interests.

FISCAL ACCOUNTABILITY

There was universal acceptance of fiscal accountability as a statewide priority. This topic had several dimensions and they are noted in order of responses:

There is a need for a statewide system of community colleges as a result of state funding.

The Board of Governors should be accountable in seeing that the state is "getting its money's worth".

There is a need for more useful fiscal policy information based on uniform reporting.

The Chancellor's Office should give strong leadership.

USEFUL QUOTATIONS (Clustered)

"Community colleges have the capabilities of getting disadvantaged students into higher skills. We should do a better job."

"I'm not sure students who need help the most are getting it."

"The community college is the place of first resort for those who lack (proper) high school preparation."

"No one should be denied an education: education is the key to coping in our society."

"If the state pays for one (first) degree, the student should pay for the second one."

"We should recognize that needs are not confined to the poor, but also to those hurt by the economy."

"Community colleges should get students who haven't been educated

- and who don't know what (options) are available."
- "Increased education equals increased economic benefit. We have got to get that message to Legislature and Executive branch."
- "There is a lot of duplication of programs, particularly in urban areas."
- "Community colleges should provide education for personal enrichment as well as livelihood."
- "Residency should be defined as the workplace."
- "ALA-driven formulae are at the root of our problems."
- "Colleges should be allowed to offer less expensive courses in order to balance the cost of expensive ones."
- "I'm not ready to face tuition: let us not get locked into responses to problems which will change."
- "There is not wide public interest in providing avocational education from state funding."
- "Even if the Legislature had pushed, the cut in avocational courses wouldn't have happened without the Board of Governors."
- "I don't see local control functioning as in the past."
- "The BOG shouldn't administer but set statewide parameters."
- "We should study and provide leadership in determining where authority should be in the (state system)."
- "The Legislature should not whipsaw the colleges by mandates and compliance. It's better for the Board and the Chancellor's Office to be stronger."

USEFULNESS OF FIPSE PROJECT...IN ADOPTING STATEWIDE PRIORITIES (General consensus at Tahoe, use and evaluation in FIPSE, Board of Governors' feedback and refinement.)

First, most Board members argued; others assumed that the Board would move on statewide priorities at the Tahoe retreat.

A large majority feel that the FIPSE approach (experimentation, evaluation, and feedback to Board) is a good way to go.

Two members were neutral at the time of the interview while the remaining members said that the Board should establish directions and be assured of followup and feedback.

USEFUL QUOTATIONS

- "FIPSE approach would help Board focus attention and arrive at decisions."
- "Beg off because I don't know enough about FIPSE. Could be marvelous way to go."
- "Statewide priorities should be assessed."
- "I want the accreditation teams to attempt to measure."
- "Trying the priorities out in the FIPSE Project is the way to go."
- "FIPSE field testing and feedback will provide an impetus for us at Tahoe...it will not be just an exercise in words."
- "What does FIPSE displace?"
- "Lay boards don't spend enough time on these issues. FIPSE effort in using priorities should be articulated to the Board."

IMPROVING THE STATE INFORMATION SYSTEM

In supporting better and more complete information for planning and decisionmaking, many Board members stressed the importance of having information with policy interpretations rather than just more raw data. Others cautioned about possible misuse of aggregate data.

COMPARATIVE DATA FOR SELF STUDIES AND COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING

The proposed improvements were essentially supported by all Board members with some noting that institutions should use uniform reporting. A strong comment was "that the time for candor is upon us".

TREND, STUDENT OUTCOME INFORMATION

There is widespread conviction that such information is needed but not now available. One member summed up his response by saying "the client is too often forgotten".

AGGREGATE FISCAL INFORMATION

"We need honest assessments so that we know how the system is doing" seems to reflect a general consensus about the importance of comprehensive planning information.

USEFUL QUOTATIONS

- "I need to know what is going on; what the trends are."
- "Mistakes can be made when data are aggregated."
- "My bookshelves are full of reports; what do they mean?"
- "Longitudinal information need not be too complex. Spot checks can be made from time to time."
- "The Chancellor's staff needs to provide such information to the field."
- "Having good data is like motherhood: but raw data need to be accurately interpreted."
- "Chancellor's staff need to know what other states--even other countries--are doing."
- "Perhaps: if colleges are not doing a good job in preparing students, communities will know it."
- "The course classification system we have now is not well devised."

IMPORTANCE OF LOCAL GOVERNANCE

At least a majority of Board members clearly view the California community college network (system) as one with shared governance and view local boards as essential. Some members noted that "a state-dominated system would not work".

There is an equally strong belief that local boards should function within parameters set by the Board of Governors. A few members stated this idea a bit differently: "local boards should only have control over local issues".

There is widespread conviction that the leadership and guidance roles of the Board of Governors and the Chancellor are increasingly important.

USEFUL QUOTATIONS

- "I'm not sure what words like control and authority mean."

- "Local authority zealots amaze me! What they don't want to do they turn over to us."
- "I believe in 'bottoms-up' governance."
- "Proposition 13 was really unfortunate. We need to pass the centralized control back to local boards."
- "Some issues can only be handled locally."
- "Authority and responsibility go together. There must be more accountability."
- "Local boards to reflect unique local conditions...but local boards are often too emotional."
- "Dumping avocational courses...we had to do it, but we may have thrown the baby out with the bath water."
- "CEOs are an endangered species if we don't get good working relations among the Board of Governors and local boards."
- "We need as much local authority as possible, but local boards should provide facts about what they are doing."

VALUES OF COLLABORATION IN FIPSE PROJECT AMONG BOG/CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE, COMMISSION FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE ACCREDITATION, AND LOCAL INSTITUTIONS

RIGHT DIRECTION?

All Board members like the concept of working together and nearly everyone thinks this is the way to go.

Two members are neutral until they know more about the Project. This would seem to reflect a general need to know more about FIPSE.

KNOWLEDGE OF NEW ACCREDITATION STANDARDS

Very few Board members know about the new accreditation standards. Several of you asked for copies which will be available at Tahoe.

Most Board members know little about professional accreditation. Of the few who do, there are equal numbers who have positive views or who have reservations.

There is widespread receptivity to the use of assessable standards in preparing self studies and in joint institutional reviews.

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING

Many members think that fragmentation is a problem, and that "the pieces should be put together" in both staff and institutional planning.

USEFUL QUOTATIONS

- "Experimental approach is good!"
- "We need standards for evaluation."
- "Have Board members at FIPSE training session."
- "Cross fertilization in FIPSE is good."
- "Dynamite!"
- "I don't know now who is fertilizing (whom)."
- "FIPSE idea will work well with proper leadership and mutual trust."
- "Important for Board to have feedback and be involved in FIPSE."

INCREASING CONFIDENCE IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE ACCOUNTABILITY

Suggestions were made by all Board members. Certain general ideas were apparent across the 15 interviews. Among them are:

The need for better public relations and responding to the public's need to know what is going on and why.

Understanding the educational needs of society and responding to the widespread demands for accountability.

The need for more objective evaluation.

USEFUL QUOTATIONS

"We have to be able to take the heat from local districts."

"Is the system working? We have to get a gauge on that."

"We have to get out front with the public and the Legislature.

They will respond if they know why we are doing certain things."

"Board members should have informal exchanges with people in the field...such as our conversations with the CEOs."

"We need to eliminate unnecessary competition within and across local districts."

"We need a funding system that has incentives for accountability."

"I regret the loss of confidence---we have to respond to what the people want to know."

"Board of Governors' leadership and guidance is important. We demonstrated that in our dinner with Legislators."

"Planning and evaluation should involve local boards in responding to unique communities, and BOG in statewide concerns."

"We need to insure wise use of fees."

"Top faculty and good teaching..."

"We must insist on quality student performance."

"The Roundtable is a very good idea!"

SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS

Appreciation is expressed to each member of the Board of Governors for the time, thoughtfulness, and ideas which made the interviews so useful. The opportunity to feed back your own thinking on important policy and governance issues is a great foundation for our work together at Lake Tahoe. The process should lead to consensus building, decisions, and followup.

A parallel report of interviews with the 30 "principal agents", primarily in Sacramento, will be shared with you at Tahoe. The areas of agreement are quite remarkable and I hope will be both encouraging and useful to you.

The substance of your views about the FIPSE Project are vital in carrying out its objectives of improving capabilities in evaluation and planning, and in developing effective joint institutional reviews.

Dale Tillery
August, 1982

HAWAII POLICYMAKERS

Extensive interviews on matters of planning and evaluation in the State of Hawaii were held with administrators, faculty, and lay and government leaders by Dale Tillery from November 8-19, 1982. The purposes of the interviews were to:

- o communicate the goals of the FIPSE Project for improving capabilities for evaluation and planning in the community colleges of Hawaii and California;
- o seek views of principal agents regarding FIPSE goals and about planning in Hawaiian higher education; and
- o provide greater understanding of the University of Hawaii system of higher education generally and of the community colleges specifically; this knowledge to be used in FIPSE planning for cooperative training workshops with community staff members in Spring 1983.

Thirty-four formal interviews were completed; related discussions were held with an additional score of informed individuals; eight campuses were visited (including some class visitations); and at the request of Chancellor Kim, an interview was given to the Honolulu Star Bulletin which was published on November 22, 1982. Chancellor Dewey Kim, a member of the Project Advisory Committee, and his staff, were exceptionally gracious and efficient in arranging interviews and related matters. Special appreciation is given to Dr. Lawrence Wakui and Janice Miyashiro who coordinated day-to-day activities.

HAWAII'S COMMITMENT TO PLANNING

In addressing the increasing aspirations and diversity of its people in a time of scarce resources, the State of Hawaii has made unusual commitments to planning by public and private entities, and to strategies for coordinating the resulting plans. There are 12 State Plans each of which addresses statewide needs and issues and recommends policies and priority actions to mitigate problems and bring about desired solutions.* Although plans are prepared by state agencies, they:

- o are not interpreted as law or statutory mandates;
- o involve some actions for the federal and county governments and of the private sector;

* The areas of planning are: Agriculture, Conservation Lands, Education, Energy, Health, Higher Education, Historic Preservation, Housing, Recreation, Tourism, Transportation and Water Resource Development.

- o draw on and contribute to knowledge embodied in the County General Plans and Development Plans;
- o have primary resource bases, known as Technical Reference Documents, to support the objectives, policies, implementing priorities and actions of each plan; these documents show the plan's relationships with other state and county plans;
- o are influenced by state agency advisory committees composed of state and county officials, members of the public, and experts in the field; and
- o are reviewed and, if necessary, amended every two years.

Hawaii's comprehensive approach to planning is embedded in local, county and state political processes which forces compromises and accommodations within and among agencies. It is also dependent upon the uneven capabilities of individuals and groups to set goals and objectives, determine priorities, gather and process useful information, evaluate outcomes, and effectively use resources in goal achievement.

Interview Findings:

1. There is widespread acceptance of Hawaii's mode of statewide planning which brings state and local officials, field experts, and public representatives into the planning process; and which seeks to coordinate plans of the various components of the state's socio-economic structure.
2. There is, however, a wide range of views about the efficacy of implementing state plans and the validity of forecasting. Some feel that there are too many plans and that not enough is done about them.
3. General consensus exists on a set of challenges, opportunities, and expectations for Hawaii in the 1980's and the foreseeable future. In broad outline they include:
 - a. The emergence of Asian and Pacific nations to positions of influence and power in world affairs, and the role of Hawaii as a bridge between East and West.
 - b. The growth of tourism in the Pacific basin, and Hawaii's international leadership in the expertise and technical assistance for this and related industries.
 - c. New sources of energy and approaches to agriculture and aquaculture.
 - d. The importance of education in developing the talents and productivity of a diverse population.
4. Planning which reflects the interests of other groups is viewed, particularly by state officials, as the means of unifying the people of Hawaii in addressing problems and opportunities.

Quotations:

"Planning documents are too much like budget documents; it is important to attend to how things are done rather than just setting goals."
University Planner

"Plans give better understanding of the future. It is important to have community input." Legislator/Agency Head

"Broad goals are not sufficient." UH High-Level Administrator

"We would do long-term planning even if the state didn't require it."
CC Provost

"Too much of it (planning): Not enough done." CC Senate President

"The potential for long-term planning is great." UH/CC Leader

HIGHER EDUCATION PLANNING IN HAWAII

The University of Hawaii is the state agency which prepares and implements the State Higher Education Plan. Although founded in 1907 as a land-grant college of agriculture and mechanical arts, the University is now a complex system of public educational institutions involved in teaching, research, and service. The system has nine campuses and dozens of research institutes. Each major segment of the University is responsible to a Chancellor who reports to the President and to the Board of Regents of the University of Hawaii. The State Higher Education Plan, which was approved by the Governor in May, 1982, is a guide to coordinate various sectors of government and independent institutions whose interests are represented by members of the State Higher Education Plan Advisory Committee.

The Plan recognizes that the nature of colleges and universities imposes limitations on their abilities to respond to state objectives. In particular, the contributions of the liberal education components of programs must not be overlooked; and the aggregate effects of individual free choices in a free society will ultimately determine the directions of institutions of higher education.

The Community Colleges: This interplay of state interests, local educational needs, and student response is of particular importance to the seven community colleges in Hawaii, six of which report to the Chancellor for Community Colleges and one to the Chancellor of the University of Hawaii, Hilo. The community colleges' Directions for the 1980's is reflective of the initiative and planning of the several colleges, each of which seek maximum program comprehensiveness in responding to the educational needs of the community it serves. Implementation of the Directions is primarily through the activities of individual colleges as set forth in their Educational Development Plans and budget documents. Consistent with community college philosophy of responsiveness and program flexibility, the colleges and the system are expected to re-evaluate directions and plans at least twice during the decade.

INTERVIEW FINDINGS:

1. Planning which reflects state leadership, recognizes the interests of other groups, and involves wide participation, is considered appropriate if not essential for institutional and system survival.

2. Community colleges have been more effective in planning and in political articulation of plans than have other segments of the University. There is belief within the University and among state officials that planning (Hawaii style) is easier for community colleges because of their community connections, scope of programs, and their direct relevance to the immediate and anticipated occupational needs of the state.
3. Planning has brought the nature of the University under examination. Among the prominent issues are:
 - a. enhancing the identity of the Manoa campus as a world-class university;
 - b. improving articulation across institutions and programs;
 - c. considering the community colleges as a separate system. Although this idea is frequently discussed, there is no movement in this direction; and
 - d. making higher education more flexible in responding to anticipated leadership of Hawaii in East-West affairs, new high technologies, and increasing demands for quality education.
4. The comparative success of community college planning appears to have influenced the shift of certain community college officials into leadership roles in University-wide administration.
5. Expectations of political leaders and state officials for state plans with more specific objectives rather than broad goals may increase tensions among constituency groups within the University and on individual campuses. However, there appears to be strong commitments to widespread participation in planning and evaluation.
6. High-level community college administrators express the view that planning and program review would be done even if it were not required by the state. Although no strong resistance to planning per se was noted among the faculty leaders, concerns were expressed about "lack of lead time for budgeting and planning" and for "too many plans".
7. The FIPSE Project strategy of cycling educational development planning with accreditation self-studies and of joint reviews seems to pose no serious problems for the Hawaii Community Colleges. The trade-offs in reducing duplication of effort are well received; and Directions for the 1980's and the EDP's are already the basis for institutional review.

Quotations:

"Good planning is taking place at the University, particularly in the community colleges." University-Wide Official

"The University is really a system of postsecondary education. This is not yet well understood." University Dean

"We have the documents, but articulation is crucial." University High-Level Administrator

"Happy with community college planning...although it needs some streamlining." State Planner

"More planning here than any place I've been. There is strength in educational development planning." University Chancellor

"Community colleges have only recently gotten into planning mode." CC Provost

"I am concerned about reality of budget crisis." CC Faculty Leader

"We need system to assist us on campus to do planning." CC Provost

"It's tough to go to the Board of Regents with a program not in an EDP." University High-Level Administrator

"The community colleges allow for flexibility; they are not directed from Honolulu." A Regent

THE HAWAII COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND THE FIPSE PROJECT

Because the interview schedule was used as a general guide and the interviewees were viewed as principal agents rather than as representative of constituency groups, the following major findings reflect the interviewer's impressions rather than a summary of objective data:

1. The primary objectives of the FIPSE Project are well received both by those who are directly involved in state planning and by those who are skeptical of "bureaucracy" or unimpressed with formal planning procedures. The most attractive elements are:
 - a. cycling of educational development planning with the accreditation self-study;
 - b. involving broad institutional participation in the planning and evaluation processes;
 - c. developing better information resources for assessing community needs and in demonstrating institutional and system achievements;
 - d. ensuring that goal setting, evaluation and planning will involve those who do the work of the colleges rather than "technicians" only; and
 - e. improving capabilities in planning and evaluation through training workshops.
2. Directions for the 1980's seems to represent reasonable consensus about certain community college priorities. Wide support was evident for:
 - a. broadened access to quality and low-cost education within students' own communities;
 - b. comprehensive programs for each community college within limits of state resources, and with some regional or island specialization in high-cost or low-demand programs;

- c. continued improvement in the quality of instruction and programs.
3. It is difficult to determine the breadth of support for a cluster of directions related to administrative services. Support for "strengthening college administrations", "cooperation in educational development", "reassessment of activities", and "coordination among campuses" is strong among college, University, and state officials. It is likely that faculty members may view specific aspects of these directions differently while being supportive of the improvement of administration and of effective leadership of the colleges and the system.
4. The "budget crisis" in Hawaii seems real and painful to most interviewees but unreal to some. In general, however, the fiscal situation is a compelling stimulus for planning, evaluation, and effective communication of achievements and needs.
5. The following FIPSE Project objectives were appraised favorably and frequently with enthusiasm:
 - a. Improving methods of assessing community needs: Both the costs and risks of forecasting were noted, but almost everyone recognized the need for community colleges to assess the socio-economic characteristics of communities and their trends. Linkages with communities are perceived to be good now, but improved methods of determining and interpreting community education needs are seen as important.

Quotations:

"Forecasting that is concerned with the quality of growth and change is important." University Planner

"We need a breath of fresh air...objective view of things."
State Education Official

"There are different (forecasting) problems in different service areas of the state." Labor/Professions Leader

"Yes, but with caution; Hawaii is a small state so we need a network-kind of decision (making) about the future." University/CC Leader

"It's important to dream a little about the future. You have to have something to offer in (developing) human talent."
Legislator/Agency Head

"Assessment should be comprehensive. Good stuff!" CC Provost

- b. Improving the assessment of student outcomes: The greater the distance from the classroom the more appealing this objective becomes. However, there is widespread conviction that the profession and the public are placing greater emphasis on knowing what happens to students. Furthermore, the case for college and system accomplishments is strengthened by accurate and timely reporting of the evidence. Since there is general uncertainty about valid and cost-effective methods of assessing

learner outcomes, the FIPSE contributions are welcomed.

Quotations:

"The Legislature has high regard for community college input/output ratios; but we need evidence." University Administrator

"You have to know what happens to students, but (it) must be associated with what you intend to do." Labor/Professional Leader

"Results about student outcomes is what we want; we haven't seen much of that." State Planner

"Terribly important! But post-measurement is not only way to go. It's important to get at student attitudes." University/CC Leader

"Not too much faculty hostility in getting at student outcomes." Community College Dean

"We want good techniques!" Faculty Senate President

"This is the pay-off!" Legislator/Agency Head

- c. Statewide information on student outcomes: There is general agreement that learner/student outcomes have been neglected in state aggregate information. There was recognition of the difficulties and costs of gathering certain outcome data. A balance between data gathering and use was urged by several people. The University information system seems capable of handling such data.

Quotations:

"Yes, but don't know much about students who leave after a short time...need (new techniques)." CC Faculty Members

"Effort is not too good. It's important to consider input data and relative progress." University High-Level Administrator

- d. Joint institutional review (ACCJC and Office of the Chancellor of Community Colleges): This approach is well received both by those who do the work of preparing for institutional review and by those who consider the idea more abstractly. Cycling the two review procedures suggests substantial reductions in college resources and time. There is also reasonable consensus that the joint effort may improve planning and evaluation...and thus enhancing confidence in institutional accountability. Except for University and college staff who are involved in accreditation, there is little awareness of the new accreditation standards.

Quotations:

"There should be a good relationship between accreditation and college planning." A Regent

"Very much worth trying...the trade-offs sound good. May lead to missions more sharply focused." University Dean

"Accreditation should be non-governmental...and the new standards are helpful." University Planner

"Cycling of accreditation and EDP's will give new attention to standards of quality." Legislator/Agency Head

"Not very aware of new standards but think they are good for promoting quality...That's important in a highly centralized state."
University High-Level Administrator

"We will need time, particularly if we don't use a subset of standards."
Community College Provost

"Appreciate accreditation guidelines (standards)." CC Dean

"In Hawaii the University of the state agency...so there is no problem if accreditation will improve institutions." State Planner

- e. There was universally favorable response to the FIPSE training workshops to improve capabilities in planning and evaluation. Involved University officials are prepared to facilitate participation, and several people urged broad participation in the colleges.

Quotations:

"Will faculty members be involved? They too want (responsibility) in planning." A Regent

"Training could be effective...beware!...technical people are taking over institutions." University Dean

"We are committed to involving staff. How to do it?" CC Provost

"The FIPSE visit can help. It will be (important) to establish a task force before visits." CC Dean

"The workshops sound good, particularly with participation from outside islands." CC Provost

6. Collaboration between non-governmental self-study and review procedures and continuing efforts to achieve the objectives of educational development plans is viewed as a substantial contribution to improving college and system accountability. The Hawaii Community Colleges are viewed as major contributors to the achievement of wide access to higher education, and to the preparation of skilled workers for the state's private and public enterprises. This success has generated competition for resources from the public schools and other segments of the University. Continued public and political support are enhanced by successful and well-understood outcomes in providing quality and socially-relevant education which is cost effective.

Quotations:

"There is a schism between schools and community colleges regarding vocational education and funding." Education Leader

"The community colleges are in good shape: they have matured."
Legislator/Agency Head

"Perhaps community colleges should have been separated from University."
Community College Senate President

"The community colleges have changed the University. They are (also)
serving the state well." University/Community College Leader

"Community colleges are a mixed bag in (reference) to responsiveness,
quality, and leadership." University Administrator

The Hawaii Community Colleges enter the difficult decade of the 1980's with a reputation of achieving major objectives of the state for higher education. Their maturity is manifest in the quality of faculty and administrative leadership. The problems facing the colleges, like those of other states, are perhaps balanced by pride of achievement and readiness to change and improve. The FIPSE Project should not only be instrumental toward those ends, but will further its own objectives for the use by other community colleges by working with the community colleges of Hawaii.

JACC® CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

DEC 7 1984

8118 Math-Sciences Building
Los Angeles, California 90024